



Symposium participants included (standing from left): Eric Wohlgemuth, Paul Chace, Claude Warren, Andrew Yatsko, Joseph Chartkoff, and Frank Bayham; (sitting from left): Lynn Compas, Mary Maniery, David Doyle, Dave Fredrickson, Mark Kowta, Antoinette Martinez, Jack Broughton, and Keith Johnson. Not pictured: Joan Schneider, Robert L. Bettinger.

COMMENTS ON PAPERS PRESENTED IN HISTORY, PROCESS, AND TRADITION
A SYMPOSIUM FOR MAKOTO KOWTA

JOSEPH L. CHARTKOFF

The diversity of papers presented in this symposium shows us the many dimensions in which Mark Kowta's significance as a teacher, mentor, research scholar and colleague can be appreciated. Through these varied roles, Mark Kowta has made many outstanding contributions to California archaeology and its related dimensions in higher education. The presented papers and their varied themes provide a very strong perspective on the diversity of Mark Kowta's talents and influences, even if such a set of papers must inevitably be an incomplete reflection of those contributions.

Let me start by reflecting on the paper presented by David A. Fredrickson, entitled, "Pre-Tribelet Cultures in the North Coast Ranges of California." On the face of it, this theme might seem not to bear much relationship to Mark Kowta's work. Dave was not one of Mark's students, nor were they faculty colleagues at Mark's campus, Chico State University. Mark and Dave did not do fieldwork together. But more connections are reflected here than may be immediately apparent.

As Dave has told me, he first heard Mark Kowta speak during the annual meetings of the old Southwestern Anthropological Association in 1966, before the Society for California Archaeology had even been created. Mark gave a presentation on his work at the Sayles Site near San Bernardino. Dave was so impressed by Mark's innovative analysis of the behavioral implications of the lithic industry's technology at the Sayles Site that it made a lasting impression on him. That influence was not just to make him more aware of the potential implications that could be derived from lithic analysis. It showed him the value and excitement of being able to think innovatively, "outside the box," as it were, about the meaning of cultural patterns more generally.

Thus Dave's discussion of non-tribelet structure as a way to look at social organization outside the established perspectives can be linked to Mark Kowta's achievement of looking at Milling Stone assemblages in the Cajon Pass area outside the normative time frame which had been in use in Southern California archaeology. Here, the influence of scholarly innovation is revealed in a new context.

Lynn Compas of PAR Environmental Services gave a very stimulating paper, entitled, "Stuck in the Mud: Prehistoric and Ethnographic Land Use at Lake Almanor." Lynn's paper gives us a very different perspective on the significance of Mark Kowta's research. In this case, we can see Mark's influence resulting from some very innovative work in a major, but previously under-studied, region of the northern Sierra Nevada. Lynn's discussion reflects Mark's influence in at least two different senses. One refers to the high quality of his original research. Not only did Mark play a major part in establishing the region's archaeological and prehistoric cultural framework, but his construction of that framework has stood the test of time and has proven itself still well able to incorporate more recent discoveries within its structure.

In addition, however, Lynn has drawn attention to Mark's continuing practice of linking archaeological data to other perspectives in culture change and cultural evolution. This is another example of him bringing his greater theoretical perspective to new circumstances, to help bring new data into better understanding. It is a classical example of what philosophers of science call the deductive-inductive method of reasoning and explanation. For archaeology, though, it also can be said that Mark has continued to think outside the box and has inspired others to do so as well. The fact that the thinking Mark was doing up to a quarter of a century ago is still inspiring

innovation in the thinking of other researchers today is itself a wonderful testimony to Mark's intellectual significance.

Jerald Johnson's paper, "The 'Yahi' and Southern Yana: Conservatism, Genetic Isolation, and an Impoverished Resource Base" was read by Greg Greenway. Johnson's paper emphasized themes of culture change, cultural ecology, and cultural evolution. Here is yet another case in which scholarly themes defined, developed, and promoted by Mark Kowta, in some cases for more than a quarter of a century, are still being reflected in innovative thinking today among his colleagues. It is continuing evidence of Mark's influence and intellectual significance. It gives us a particularly compelling bit of evidence that the concept of a scholarly community has some empirical reality.

Jerry used a case in a region also studied by Mark to bring together several perspectives in cultural ecology and cultural evolution to help understand the region's archaeological and ethnographic records. One can look at earlier archaeology in the region, which focused on such topics as projectile point styles and chronology, to appreciate the significance of Mark's areas of emphasis in the dynamics of culture and adaptation. It reflects the timing and direction of Mark's intellectual development, as expressed by Lewis Binford in his classic paper, "Archaeology as Anthropology."

The next paper was presented by Mary Maniery and was titled, "Annie Bidwell and the Chico Rancheria." [Not submitted for publication - Ed.] Mary's extraordinarily creative paper used the persona of Annie Bidwell, as ostensible speaker, to present perspectives on the ethnohistory of the Maidu community in the Chico area during the second half of the 19th century. This use of Annie Bidwell as both a framework for historical perspective and as a means to personalize the Maidu experience is extremely evocative. Even the inferred quality of the speaker's voice is conveyed effectively. Mary's paper definitely wins the prize for intellectual creativity among the presentations at the symposium, and probably for the entire annual meeting. It is not just a tribute to her abilities, however. Her evocative essay honors Mark in many ways. It offers a marvelous tribute to Mark's own creative influence as a teacher who

provided his students with a rigorous scholarly foundation at the same time he has inspired them to think innovatively.

Mary's own continuing intellectual evolution has been fostered by Mark's influence. That influence is reflected in part by her own ability to slide effortlessly into new paradigms. At the same time, those of us who have had the good fortune to do fieldwork in the Chico area can recognize in Mary's story the research foundations and historical perspectives that are so clearly rooted in sound scholarship. Mark's influence in terms of fostering intellectual creativity while also fostering strong scholarly standards is thus reflected in yet another case.

Finally, Antoinette Martinez presented her offering, entitled "History, Process, Tradition, and the Role of Women in California Archaeology." On the face of it, this topic appears to have little connection to Mark Kowta's own career, but Nettie discussed just how, in fact, it did. Her presentation provides us with insights from a perspective of collegiality and mentoring. It emphasizes the importance of Mark as an influential teacher. Several of the papers presented in the symposium have been presented by women who were students at Chico State and who have benefited from Mark's influence as their instructor. As a teacher, Mark not only provided strong intellectual leadership in sound methodology, creative thinking, and solid foundations in knowledge, he did so in a particularly fair, even-handed, and universally supportive way. Nettie's historical review notes just how few women achieved significant roles in the early decades of California archaeology, while the pattern today is quite different. Mark is one of the teachers whose openness and fairness encouraged many of the women students in his department to pursue careers in archaeology.

In another sense, Nettie's review of the changing history of women's participation in California archaeology is itself an example of culture change and cultural evolution, in honor of one of Mark's sustained theoretical perspectives. In this case, the culture happens to be that of our own discipline, and it is healthy for us to share in that sort of anthropological perspective. But it also reflects Mark's emphasis on innovative thinking, or thinking outside the box, on responding to questions with new questions, and

on finding questions where many others have been looking without necessarily having conceptualized the questions that were there. Nettie's thinking honors Mark in reflecting his ability to see new issues and problems emerging from our growth in knowledge.

CONCLUDING PERSPECTIVES

Some of the papers in the symposium honor Mark Kowta by following some of the themes, issues, questions or theoretical perspectives he has fostered over the course of his career. Other papers have honored him by doing the kind of innovation he has so long encouraged, even though not on the same themes he has pursued. In doing so, they show us that Mark has led, not by ruling, but by setting examples and inspiring others. The very volunteerism of this sort of effect speaks volumes about the richness and healthiness of his leadership and influence. He has been a precious colleague, a guide and a mentor, and a significantly contributing scholar in the very best sense. Thus it is a real honor, privilege and delight to express California archaeology's genuine appreciation of him.